Case	4:19-cr-00026 Document 114 Filed on 10/16/23 in	TXSD Page 1 of 61
		1
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS	
3	HOUSTON DIVISION	
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	4:19-cr-0026
5		
6	VS.	August 2, 2023 Houston, Texas
7	ELEXIS KIERRA SIDNEY	8:52:17 a.m.
8		
9		
10		
11	SENTENCING	
12	BEFORE THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUDGE RANDY CRANE	
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
14	APPEARANCES:	
15		Wimbords Ico AUCA
16	For the United States	Kimberly Leo, AUSA U. S. Attorney's Office 1000 Louisiana Street
17		Suite 2300 Houston, Texas 77002
18	For the Defendant	
19	roi the Delendant	Alex Rosa-Ambert, AFPD Office of the Federal Public Defender
20		440 Louisiana Street Suite 1350
21		Houston, Texas 77002
22	Case Manager	M. Morgan
23	Electronic Recording Operator	Shannon Holden
24	Also Present	Jennifer Franklin U. S. Probation Office
25	Proceedings from official electronic sound recording; transcript produced by court approved transcriber.	
	DIGITAL SCROLL TRANSCRIPTION	281.382.9862

```
1
             THE COURT: All right.
 2
                  Good morning, everyone.
                  Please be seated.
 3
 4
                  All right. Let me call this morning 19-cr-26,
 5
    USA versus Elexis Kierra Sidney.
 6
             MS. LEO: Good morning, Your Honor, Kimberly Leo on
 7
    behalf of the United States.
 8
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Good morning, Your Honor, Alex Omar
 9
    Rosa-Ambert on behalf of the Defendant.
10
             THE COURT: Good morning, again.
11
             MS. LEO: Your Honor?
12
             THE COURT: Yes.
1.3
             MS. LEO: If I just may?
14
             THE COURT: You may.
15
             MS. LEO: There is a - there are two victims in
16
    regards to this particular case.
17
             THE COURT: Um-hmm.
18
             MS. LEO: One of the parents for Victim No. 2 is
    actually on her way to the courthouse. I believe she was
19
20
    stuck in some traffic.
21
             THE COURT: Um-hmm.
22
             MS. LEO: We just spoke to her, and she should be
23
    here in about 10 to 15 minutes.
24
             THE COURT: Okay.
25
             MS. LEO: So, I apologize to the Court. We had told
```

```
1
    her to be here by nine o'clock. I don't know if the Court
 2
    could maybe -
             THE COURT: So, you said there were people for both
 3
    victims. One of them was her daughter.
 4
 5
             MS. LEO: Yes, Your Honor.
                  This is - oh, no. One was her son.
 6
 7
             THE COURT: Her son.
 8
             MS. LEO: The other one was -
 9
             THE COURT: The two-year-old?
10
             MS. LEO: -- her niece.
11
                  Her son is the two-year-old.
12
             THE COURT: Okay.
1.3
             MS. LEO: And then, there is a three-year-old niece.
14
                  So, the mother of the three-year-old niece is on
15
    her way.
16
             THE COURT: Okay.
17
                  All right. Well -
18
             MS. LEO: And, Your Honor, if the Court -
             THE COURT: Ten or fif- --
19
20
             MS. LEO: -- wants to go forward, she just -
21
             THE COURT: Now -
22
             MS. LEO: -- may be coming in late, and I'm not sure
23
    if she wants to address the Court.
             THE COURT: Well, I assume she's coming because she
24
25
    wants to allocute.
```

```
1
             MS. LEO: That -
 2
             THE COURT: Or at least see -
 3
             MS. LEO: Yes, Your Honor.
 4
             THE COURT: And -
 5
             MS. LEO:
                      And she was here the last time before it
    was reset, and so, she was - she wanted to be present.
 6
 7
             THE COURT: Sure.
 8
             MS. LEO: And so, I just wanted to bring that to the
    Court's attention that she should be here in 10 or 15 minutes.
 9
10
             THE COURT: Is that her sister or sister-in-law?
11
             MS. LEO: I believe it would be sis- -- akin to a
12
    sister-in-law.
13
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: It is her sister-in- -- similar to
    it, Your Honor. Yes.
14
15
             THE COURT: Okay.
16
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: On that note, Your Honor, I do
    acknowledge that the Court wanted these proceedings to be
17
18
    closed.
            However, on - over my left shoulder is my client's
19
    family.
20
             THE COURT:
                         Sure.
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: They also want to be present in the
21
22
    proceedings.
23
             THE COURT: Of course.
24
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT:
                               Yeah.
25
             THE COURT: I just don't do porn cases with any other
```

```
1
    defendants who are going to be back in the same facility,
    because often it presents security problems. Those people end
 2
    up getting victimized. You have to put them in solitary and
 3
    keep them away from other -
 4
 5
                  But I understand she's in general population
 6
    right now, and probably people are aware of what her charges
 7
    are, so maybe not as important that I follow my own policy in
 8
    that regard. But it's really just to keep them away from
 9
    other prisoners.
10
                  So, I'm happy to recess for 10 minutes or 15
11
    minutes.
12
             MS. LEO: If the Court could that would be -
13
             THE COURT: Sure.
             MS. LEO: -- greatly appreciated just because I know
14
15
    she's on her way, and - and she was present the last time.
16
             THE COURT: Okay.
17
                  Well, let's give her a chance to be here.
18
    Obviously, this is a big deal to her that her child was
    victimized like this.
19
20
                  All right. Then, we'll be in recess for 10
21
    minutes or so.
22
             MS. LEO: And I apologize to the Court about this,
23
    Your Honor.
24
             THE COURT: No, it's not your fault.
25
                  All right. So, just let my Case Manager or
```

```
1
    someone know, and they'll come get me.
 2
             MS. LEO: Yes, Your Honor.
 3
             THE COURT: All right.
 4
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Thank you, sir.
 5
             THE COURT: Thanks.
                  We'll be in recess.
 6
 7
        (Recess taken at 9:00:19 a.m.)
 8
        (Proceedings resumed at 9:21:30 a.m.)
 9
             THE COURT: All right.
10
                  Good morning, again.
11
                  Please be seated.
12
                  All right. Let me recall 19-cr- -- 19-cr-52- --
1.3
    is that 6- -- sorry -- 19-cr-26, USA versus Elexis Kierra
14
    Sidney.
15
                  Announcements for the Government?
16
             MS. LEO: Good morning, Your Honor. Kimberly Leo on
17
    behalf of the United States.
18
             THE COURT: And again, for the Defendant?
19
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Good morning, Your Honor.
20
    Alex Omar Rosa-Ambert on behalf of Ms. Sidney.
21
             THE COURT: Great.
22
                  All right. So, Ms. Sidney, there was a
23
    Presentence Report prepared about you in your case. I just
    need to make sure you got a chance to review that with your
24
25
    lawyer.
```

```
1
             DEFENDANT SIDNEY: Yes, sir.
 2
             THE COURT: Perfect.
                  Okay. And let's see third acceptance point off.
 3
 4
                  I assume the Government would move for that?
 5
             MS. LEO: The Government so moves.
             THE COURT: Which I grant.
 6
 7
                  All right. Anything you want to say on behalf
 8
    of your client?
 9
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Yes, Your Honor. I don't want to
10
    belabor what I stated in my - on both the memos that I filed
11
    in this case.
12
             THE COURT: Yeah. I did read and re-read - I got
1.3
    ready last time - and then, I re-read your lengthy memo, the
14
    Government's lengthy response, your lengthy reply that I think
15
    came in yesterday.
                  And I've read all the attachments; I've read the
16
17
    initial information on the victims who - who filed victim
18
    impact statements. And I've read the psychological reports as
19
    well on your client.
20
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Yes, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: So, I'm familiar with all of that.
21
22
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: I -
23
             THE COURT: And any points you want to make, though,
24
    please feel free.
25
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: I would have thought by reference
```

what I stated in my memo, so I do want to say that I think
that this case is - that one case that is a struggle for - for
all of us, Your Honor.

Just to provide context to the Court - as the Court can see, this case is from 2019.

THE COURT: Um-hmm.

1.3

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: I arrived at the Public Defender's Office in late 2021. The case wasn't moving at all, and I think that Ms. Leo and I did our very best to move it along just because, again, it's such a difficult case to handle, right.

THE COURT: Um-hmm.

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: This is that unique case where we, obviously, feel sympathetic towards the victims. The facts are - let's say - complex.

However, I think that the real question before the Court is not whether the facts reflect the Guidelines that were imposed in this case. We're not objecting what the Guidelines are. What we are trying to convince the Court of is that there are circumstances that led to this and the Court should vary to give the Defendant an opportunity to come - to go back to the community.

I do believe that Ms. Sidney is redeemable. I think that the first fact that would be reflective of that is that her family is here, even though this is family that now

takes care of one of the victims in the case.

1.3

2.1

Again, we're not trying to minimize what happened. I do believe that they now understand and have a better grasp of what she suffered through in her early years, not only with she being a victim herself but also with the whole mental struggles that she was enduring. We don't even know that the costs of those mental health struggles were the fact that she had been a victim of the past, that it's - obviously remains to be seen; we just don't have the resources to engage in that particular type of study.

But I do believe that, again, considering her circumstances, considering that she was, not only once but twice in a mental health institution with suicidal ideations before this happened.

The fact that she was groomed once she was assaulted as a child then groomed as a man when she was only 12 years old I think that I need to take objection to the Government and this idea that she should have known better. That's precisely the problem, Your Honor. She doesn't fully understand or grasp the extent of the trauma that she suffered. And there's a godzillian studies about that. I don't think - and I don't want to belabor that. I think that the Court is aware of that. But it's - it - I - science needs to account for something.

THE COURT: Sure.

1.3

So - I guess a couple of things. I did have a curiosity why this type of case has been here for four years. I mean, these are normally one-year cases. The facts are obvious. I mean, they catch people red-handed. Here, we had a confession. The forensic report comes back pretty - I mean, this one, especially, is pretty simple. Forensics would have come back in a couple of months.

And what - I mean, you - obviously, need to get a psycho-sexual evaluation, which was done.

It seems like - it's strange.

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Again, Your Honor - but I can only account for the two years that I handled the - this case, which is essentially now that it's two years.

Before that, I think that the Pandemic had a lot to do with it, the lack of access to the client. For me, it took me a while to be able to talk to the client, because she was so closed. She didn't have any relationship with the counsel that preceded me, and that - there was a whole trust that needed to be gained. But the prosecution and I were in constant communication trying to resolve this.

THE COURT: So -

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: I just - I just think we're all
THE COURT: Yeah. It doesn't like ya'll are on the
same page at all. You said, we worked together to resolve
this, but ya'll seem quite antagonistic.

```
1
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: We - we couldn't reach a resolve.
 2
             THE COURT: Sure.
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: But we were in communication is
 3
 4
    what I'm trying to say.
 5
             THE COURT: Okay.
             MS. LEO: Your Honor, the only thing I would just add
 6
 7
    is that Mr. Rosa-Ambert is the third defense attorney on this
    case, and back in March of 2020, right before the Pandemic -
 8
 9
             THE COURT: Uh-huh.
10
             MS. LEO: -- the Defendant was actually set up to
11
    plead quilty when she was represented by another one of the
12
    Public Defenders, John Parris. He then left. I believe there
1.3
    was another FPD appointed, and then Mr. Rosa-Ambert.
14
             THE COURT: That was some of the reason.
15
             MS. LEO: So, that's -
16
             THE COURT: Some of the reason.
17
                  Okay. So then, the other questions I have -
18
                  So, she was institutionalized twice.
19
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Yes, sir.
20
             THE COURT: One of your arguments is that she - this
2.1
    was untreated. But if she's in a mental health institution,
22
    why wouldn't this childhood sexual abuse that she suffered
23
    come out and have been treated?
24
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: I - I think that the real answer to
25
    that is two-fold, Your Honor.
```

2.1

One is that victims struggle a lot divulging what happened, even with treatment. When she went to those — to those institutions was for medical emergencies and they treated for that, like they treat her there for suicidal ideations.

I will also point to the fact that she admitted or she divulged the fact that she was sexually assaulted twice as a child before I got the case. That's information that I received. And it was not something that was developed through the psychological evaluation. This is information that she gave to her mom in 2019 when they started communicating after she was detained.

So, I think that the main reason why that information is not necessarily included in those institutionalizations is because, again, they treat her for the symptoms she comes announcing or which, again, were suicidal ideations.

THE COURT: Okay.

Just - yeah, there's a pattern to these cases. It seems like many of them soon after they've been arrested and they're facing these enormous consequences that they reveal, oh, I was sexually abused as a child. And here, she had many opportunities along the way -

I mean, when she's 12 years old, usually by then they're old enough to cry out to mom or a counselor about what

happened. But then, again, she had these other periods in her life where she was getting mental health treatment. If this was — this problem that she had been carrying — this had such an enormous weight on her that that would have come out in one of these institutionalizations, just —

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Again, I think, Your Honor - I don't want to be a methodical -

THE COURT: Yeah.

1.3

2.1

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: But I think experience to me, specifically, has shown me otherwise.

My dad committed suicide when I was 21, and I lived with him all my life, and I wasn't aware that he had mental health problems until after he committed suicide. And this - this is not someone that I see infrequently.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: This is a person that I interacted with on a daily basis, and I was led to believe that he just had anger-management issues, which obviously, was a gross -

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: -- mis-understating of - of the gravity of the problem. It's really difficult to say when a victim or someone that is having mental health problems will actually come out and say, that there's a lot of more recent studies - especially from - there's a new institute in Harvard that deals with the intersection of the brain on the law,

1 saying that there are portions of the brain that are triggered 2 in certain circumstances, specifically in child pornography cases. They're still - they're still trying to figure out 3 4 why. 5 But right now, you want me to answer a question 6 that - as to why she didn't divulge that before; I don't know. 7 THE COURT: Only because she was in a setting that 8 called for that. At least twice she was in a setting. 9 MR. ROSA-AMBERT: I fully understand that. 10 THE COURT: Yeah. MR. ROSA-AMBERT: But that's why, again, I - I gave 11 12 the example. 1.3 THE COURT: Sure. MR. ROSA-AMBERT: But, like, that doesn't 14 15 necessarily - doesn't necessarily apply in practice. 16 take into the field, into actual human interactions it doesn't 17 necessarily apply that way. 18 I do believe that the more important pointer 19 would be the fact that she not - that she did not divulge it 20 to the people at the jail. She told her mom. THE COURT: Uh-huh. 21 22 MR. ROSA-AMBERT: So, this - this was not trying to, 23 again - if - I - I wouldn't understand the Court's concern if 24 she had just said this for the first time when she got into a

psychological evaluation, but that was not the case when she

25

2

8

9

10

11

15

18

20

25

```
was arrested. And she started to - let's say - rebuild her
    relationship with her mother was when she told her, yes, mom,
    I did this horrible thing. I'm really apologetic for it.
 3
 4
    However, these are my circumstances.
 5
                  The other factor that I wanted, again, to
    highlight to the Court is - I - I tried to provide the Court
 6
 7
    some contents - some context as to the national trends of -
             THE COURT: Sure.
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: -- sentencing in these type of
    cases saying, and this is our unicorn. We get very few female
    CP cases, much less with the circumstances of something here.
12
                  Again, I've been in this office for two and a
1.3
    half years. Before that, I was in Puerto Rico for - 13? And
14
    this is the first female CP case I've ever had.
                  So, that's why I wanted to highlight the fact
16
    that these are so unique. There's only been 74 in the nation
17
    in the last five years. Out of those, the average sentence
    has been 297 months of imprisonment, with the same sort of -
    sort of circumstances that the victim has -- had control
19
    ov- -- I'm sorry that the Defendant had control over the
    victim, that -
2.1
22
             THE COURT: And traded the porn -
23
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT:
                               Yes.
             THE COURT: -- and then distributed it.
24
```

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Created - distributed, same set of

facts.

THE COURT: Sure.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ ROSA-AMBERT: Those facts are included in my memo.

And even if we remove the gender fact out of the equation, the 779 total CP defendants that had been sentenced on these same set of circumstances the average sentence for those has been 360 months of imprisonment.

The ones that have been sentenced for life have either - have other prior criminal history or have monetized this CP that they created. That was definitely not the case here.

And again, concerning the fact that she had a lot of mental health history, that she had also controlled substances, abuse problems. She mentioned and she described, and — when she used certain drugs she felt invincible was the quote that she used, that she had this proclivity towards being influenced by older males. And as you read from the report, she started producing this when some males in that Kik chat started telling her that this was okay, that it was — this was common place. We, obviously, know that that's not the case, and she understand that — understands that now.

But in order for her to fully comply with her debt to society, she will need treatment. She will need conditions, and there's going to be a point where she's not

```
1
    going to get those while at BOP. So, the guestion before the
 2
    Court is that are we imposing punishment solely on the facts
    of the case and we're being punitive - I don't want to say for
 3
 4
    the sake of it - but at some point we do believe that she will
 5
    definitely be redeemable.
 6
                  And I - I am concerned that the Government's
 7
    suggesting that a sentence of 60 months would be lenient.
    That's not the fact of -
 9
             THE COURT: Sixty years.
10
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT:
                               Sixty years.
11
             THE COURT: Yeah.
12
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: It's not the fact to life sentence,
1.3
    Your Honor. She's about to turn 30.
14
             THE COURT: Uh-huh.
15
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: So, let's say that she gets all the
    full credit -
16
17
             THE COURT: Free her - sure.
18
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: She's going to be 82 by the time
19
    she comes out. So, that - that would be my main concern.
20
    I - I do understand that the Court needs to impose a heavy
2.1
    sentence -
22
             THE COURT: Sure.
23
                  Let me - on that line, let me just ask a few
24
    questions to Ms. Leo.
```

So - I guess first of all why did you plead

25

```
1
    her - why did she plead to four or five Counts as opposed to
    just one? Was it the desire of the Government to - to request
 2
    stacking? Is that, basically, what it came down to?
 3
 4
             MS. LEO: No, Your Honor.
 5
                  She pled guilty - actually, both Defense counsel
 6
    and I spoke about her pleading quilty to a plea agreement or
 7
    to her pleading straight up, and it was her choice to plead
 8
    straight up.
 9
                  In regards to the case, if she would have pled
10
    guilty to a plea agreement, we would have probably dropped the
11
    receipt charge or the possession charge. I don't recall off
12
    the top of my head.
1.3
             THE COURT: Uh-huh.
14
             MS. LEO: But she would have pled guilty to, for
15
    sure, the production -
16
             THE COURT: Right.
17
             MS. LEO: -- and the distribution and more than
18
    likely probably the possession. So, again, we would have been
    still -
19
20
             THE COURT: Able to stack them still -
             MS. LEO: Yes, Your Honor.
21
22
             THE COURT: -- to this point?
23
                  Okay. Okay.
24
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Yes. Yes, Your Honor.
25
             THE COURT: But that's - that was the reason why she
```

```
1
    pled to more than one Count was because ya'll wanted - ya'll
 2
    knew that you - there was going to be stacking?
             MS. LEO: In most of our cases, they plead to more
 3
 4
    than one Count.
 5
             THE COURT: Okay.
             MS. LEO: So, that's the general practice if the
 6
 7
    conduct fits -
 8
             THE COURT: Sure.
 9
             MS. LEO: -- it, then, that's what we - we offer in a
10
    plea agreement.
11
             THE COURT: Okay.
12
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Yes, Your Honor, we - there were -
13
    the sentence to plea -
14
             THE COURT: Let me - I have one more question for
15
    Ms. Leo.
16
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Yeah.
17
             THE COURT: So, the - I guess the most egregious
18
    offense, a conviction has a 360-month max. Isn't that what
19
    Congress decided was the stiffest sentence that should be
20
    given for this type of offense?
21
             MS. LEO: Your Honor, what the Defendant actually
22
    pled quilty to as far as the production - she was only charged
23
    with one Count of production for the two-year=old child, minor
    Victim No. 1.
24
25
             THE COURT: Uh-huh.
```

```
1
             MS. LEO: There was also a second victim.
 2
             THE COURT: Right.
             MS. LEO: So, the Government did not charge her with
 3
 4
    that second victim, which would have been an additional 30
 5
    years that the Court then could have used to stack as well.
 6
    So, as far as the statutory max, yes, that is the statutory
 7
    max on just a straight-up production case.
 8
                  Here, this is different. This is not just a
 9
    straight-up production case. We have two victims, and we have
10
    this occurring at multiple times. Because technically, we
11
    could have charged the Defendant with each and every time she
12
    produced -
1.3
             THE COURT: Of course.
14
             MS. LEO: -- a video.
15
             THE COURT: Sure.
             MS. LEO: And she did that, I believe, and 19 times -
16
17
    she produced 19 videos, and I believe, 17 images of her abuse
18
    of -
19
             THE COURT: MV 1.
20
             MS. LEO: -- the two-year-old, of MV 1. And then she
2.1
    produced, I believe, two images of MV 2. And so - who was
22
    three at the time.
23
             THE COURT: Sure.
24
             MS. LEO: So, as far as being a statutory maximum,
25
    yes, that is 30 years. But that can also be in different
```

circumstances.

1.3

2.1

Here, especially as minor Victim No. 1, there were sex acts that were being performed. There was fondling; there was oral sex. It wasn't just lewd and lascivious. So, looking at it, Your Honor, that's why the Government believes that a sentence of over the 30 years would be appropriate because of the various conduct, plus she didn't just memorialize her abuse of both minor Victim 1 and 2. She went ahead and distributed that abuse, and she uploaded it. And at least one time that we know of to a Kik chat group she distributed three of the videos. And we know that those videos will live on forever. So, the conduct is not just her recording her sexual abuse it's also the distribution of that abuse to other individuals. And who knows if they pass it on to other individuals.

THE COURT: Probably.

MS. LEO: We don't know. We just know that it's out there forever.

THE COURT: Sure.

The temporal length of this production - I was trying to figure out, well, when was it - because they seek - they acted very quickly in arresting her, but then when they did the forensics on her it went back - I was trying to figure out, well, how temporal -

MS. LEO: I believe - I believe it went back about

1 six months. 2 Now, her - her statement to law enforcement I 3 believe she says she's being doing this for about a year. She 4 also tells that to Dr. Hays (phonetic) in the psycho -5 THE COURT: Sure. MS. LEO: -- psychological evaluation. And when 6 7 she's discussing this with the individuals on Kik, she says 8 she's been doing this for about a year, that it took about a 9 year for her to be able to warm up to get her son to engage in 10 these types of activities. 11 THE COURT: Okay. 12 And - okay. So, you have answered those 13 questions. 14 Her - I found kind of disturbing is the report 15 from the psychologist, who, in particular page 13 - this is sort of what I look for in these reports is likely propensity 16 17 to reoffend, and he gave her a pretty high propensity to 18 reoffend. 19 Let me see. It was on page -20 MR. ROSA-AMBERT: It was moderate to high, Your 2.1 Honor.

THE COURT: Page 13 shows likelihood of pedophilia recidivism is my note.

Let's see.

There's also a pedo- -- where she revealed the

22

23

24

25

1.3

2.1

presence of pedophilic interest that provided the basis for a violation of appropriate sexual boundaries with her young son. She recalled feeling sexual attraction towards a toddler when her mother babysit, and her friend was around 10 years old. She believes her pedophiliac interests have always been present, and speculates that she might have been sexually abused as a toddler. But there was no evidence of such abuse at the time of the present evaluation. Her pedophiliac interest do not appear to be fixed, meaning her sexual interest is not exclusive with children. She also has sexual attraction towards adults, but research has shown that sexual interest in children is a strong predictor of sexual recidivism.

I guess that's - so, he's saying she continues to have pedophiliac sexual interests and that that's a strong predictor of sexual recidivism.

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: I fully understand that, Your Honor. And as I addressed in my memo, there are two factors that the Court needs to consider.

One, she remains untreated as to that. There's a whole system in place at BOP to avoid - or to lessen that risk -

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: -- of recidivism.

The other factor that the Court needs to

consider is her age when - whatever sentence the Court imposes, she's not - definitely not going to be in her twenties; her sexual drive is not going to be the same.

THE COURT: Well, I have CP cases with 70-year-old men.

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: I - I understand that, Your Honor. THE COURT: At least I've had one that I can think of off the top of my head.

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: There's a lower risk of recidivism in women, too, so that's also a factor, right? They - they don't have the power to, like, promote or continue in this type of conduct like normally men would.

So, I - I think that the risk of recidivism can be tender or treated by, again, BOP's institutionalization and the treatment that they provide for her, and they will also make sure to inform the Court as to whether she complies with that treatment or not and whether they do believe that the risk has lowered.

Moreover, the Court can put stricter conditions because at the end of the day, Your Honor, her family's here but, obviously, the two victims that she interacted with will never, ever, ever have a contact with her anymore.

And I think - again, I'm not making light of what happened. I have never tried to live in this case but the fact that she will never have contact with her son is a

1.3

very, very harsh punishment that she brought on herself. I'm not disputing that. But she won't have access to the victims anymore, and I think that should give the Court some solace as to whether she will re-offend in the future.

THE COURT: Well, I mean, she may or may not. I mean, sometimes, you know, for the sake of the victim it may be as cathartic that they have a confrontation or a discussion with the perpetrator. I mean, I always permit - well, I generally, no contact with any of the victims, but a family member, since I had a recent mother with her create - a very similar case to this - create CP with her daughter and a boyfriend of the mom's, but I permitted with the consent of the Court's contact, which is probably what I'll do here.

But again, back to my point, it seemed to me that the author was very concerned about her propensity to recidivate, because she continues to have sexual thoughts about children. So, that's something that can be treated so that she can be taught not to act on those, but she still - it's who she is. Her sexual orientation is what it is. And that can't be treated out of her.

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: But the risk can be lowered, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: I - I think that that's the question before the Court, whether that risk of re-offending

1.3

2.1

```
will lower with age and with treatment. And I think that there is information on the record to show that the answer is, yes, I think that - again, I had this case for two and a half years. She's way more reflective of the circumstances that she faces now than she was before.
```

The mere fact that she acknowledged that she has those interests would not have happened in 2019. I think that the fact that she is more than willing to go through the process and acknowledge that she has a problem, seek treatment, be able to talk about what happened to her as a child, the fact that she was groomed by an adult, that she was led to this office by other males in the Kik chat. That does show a desire or an interest to do better.

THE COURT: Well, she was led to create, but she joined -

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Yes, voluntarily.

THE COURT: -- on her own.

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Yes.

THE COURT: She already had her -

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Yes.

THE COURT: -- again, this pedophilic interests. And according to the psychiatrist, she's had those pedophilic interests since she was 10 years old. It's just who she is. It's her sexual orientation. Anyway that was a concern of mine.

1 I keep asking the questions. I don't mean to throw you off what you wanted say. If there's anything you 2 want to address. These were just concerns that the Court has 3 4 that I wanted to express so that you could make sure you 5 addressed them, but if there's anything else -6 MR. ROSA-AMBERT: I think that the Court read my 7 memos -8 THE COURT: Yes. 9 MR. ROSA-AMBERT: The Court understands my position. 10 I do not believe -11 THE COURT: Sure. 12 MR. ROSA-AMBERT: -- this is the case where life 1.3 should be a sentence imposed, Your Honor. Again, the cases 14 that I found and the statistical models provided by the U.S. 15 Sentencing Commission show that the people that get life are the most severe offenders with - and with more criminal 16 17 history. 18 THE COURT: Sure. 19 MR. ROSA-AMBERT: With prior severe criminal history 20 of a similar or akin conduct that monetize their interests. For example, like the person that you recently 21 22 sentenced. I had the opportunity read that transcript. 23 I - that's why I understood the Court's questions. But, again, we believe that's she's redeemable. 24 25 I think that the fact that her family is here means that

instead of hating her for what she did is reflective of that fact.

THE COURT: Sure.

1.3

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: And considering her age and her circumstances, again her mental health that can be treated now that was not treated before, I do believe that a sentence - I request 20 years would be sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the requisites of 3553(a).

THE COURT: All right.

I'll consider that.

And, Ms. Sidney, you're here to speak as well today. You don't have to, but if there's anything that you would like to say that you want me to consider, now is your chance to speak.

DEFENDANT SIDNEY: Yes, sir.

Thank you for allowing me to speak.

I'm not - I don't want to sit here and try to make excuses or, you know, or justify anything that I did.

Like he said, I experienced things, and the seed was planted.

And while, yes, these are things that I have thought about it - it's not - sorry, I have a hard time speaking in front of people.

But it's just - I was - I was going through a lot, and self-medicating and it just - it made it real easy for me to, I guess, allow myself to be manipulated, but that's

on me. I can't - you know - nobody else did it. That's - that's on me. And - but I just want people to just try to understand what - where my head was at.

And I have had a lot of time to sit and think about what I did. There's not a day that goes by that I don't think about what I did. And - I can't take it back. I can't - I wish I could, but I can't.

And I have to apologize to, you know, my son and Catherine and for any of the - any trauma that - future trauma that I'm going to cause or any pain that I have caused anybody. It was not my intent to cause any harm or anything.

I -

Despite what the evaluation said, too, I have no desire to want to repeat any of what I did. Like, I - I was honest about a lot, but the desi- -- I don't have that desire to do any of that.

I just - would like just a chance to prove that I - I'm better than that, because - I'm not a - I'm not a bad person. I'm not a person that's going to go around picking kids - I'm not - like, that's not me. I'm not going to do that. And I just - I just would like just a chance to prove that - that I could just be better.

THE COURT: I mean, there were two victims here. So, it's almost like, yes, you did go out and pick another kid.

That just happened to be a relative. Generally, the victims

are well-known or the child of a lover or the child - you, know, the biological child of the perpetrator. Here, was a child of a relative that was victimized. So, I see that as you did go out -

DEFENDANT SIDNEY: I di- --

1.3

2.1

THE COURT: -- and prey on another child.

DEFENDANT SIDNEY: I did.

THE COURT: And - and that's why one of your restrictions is going to be you're never going to be allowed around children.

You have this sexual desire. It's - it's your orientation. It's who you are, and you - you know, when you're on drugs, you're self-medicating, your judgment's poor, and you could act out on that. And that's - that's the worry is - when you're here, you're sober. You're thinking rationally. You know this is something you shouldn't be doing. But the worries you're going to be - in a moment a weakness that you might act out on - on your sexual orientation is a concern on the Court.

And I didn't mean to cut you off. If I - if I did, I didn't mean to.

I did want to add that - you know - one of the Government's positions here - and I don't know if you've been permitted to read their responses - but - is that if you were a victim of sexual abuse then you were - you would be aware of

1.3

the trauma, the lifetime of trauma that it's going to have on- on your victims and that - and that was something, obviously, you just didn't consider at the time is what effect this would have.

I mean, I know you're apologizing to them now.

I mean, I know you're apologizing to them now, but it will have an effect on them the rest of their lives, especially to MV 1, whose - these videos are out on the internet, so no doubt being distributed and traded amongst these traffickers.

Sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off.

DEFENDANT SIDNEY: No, you're fine.

THE COURT: Go ahead if there's anything more you want to say, and then, the Government's going to get to weigh in.

DEFENDANT SIDNEY: No, I'm through.

THE COURT: Okay.

Yeah, I wanted to look quickly - there were a number of - not a lot but there were at least a few large victims series that requested restitution. So, I need to ad- -- I need to address that. I'm trying to - I think I just saw three - yes, one, two, three. Okay.

MS. LEO: I believe, Your Honor, there are seven victims that are seeking restitution.

THE COURT: Seven?

So, the PSI ha- -- at paragraph 106 only listed

```
1
    three, and in the attachments I thought I only saw two, maybe
 2
    three. Six -
             MS. LEO: Sorry, Your Honor, six. I can't count.
 3
 4
             THE COURT: Six?
 5
             MS. LEO: Yes, Your Honor.
 6
             THE COURT: Is Mr. Garcia here, the author of this
 7
    Presentence -
 8
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Mr. Garcia is no longer at the
 9
    USPO.
10
             THE COURT: Oh, wow. This is that old?
11
                  So, who's covering for him?
12
             PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, Jennifer Franklin
13
    with the U. S. Probation. I have been reassigned to this
14
    case.
15
             THE COURT: And I only have three documented in the
16
    Presentence Reports.
17
             PROBATION OFFICER: There was - there were three
18
    documented in the Presentence Report, and then, there were
    three additional ones -
19
20
             THE COURT: Okay.
21
             PROBATION OFFICER: -- that were mentioned in the
22
    third addendum.
23
             THE COURT: Okay.
24
             PROBATION OFFICER: So, we have a total of six
25
    victims.
```

1 THE COURT: Okay. 2 PROBATION OFFICER: And that new total restitution 3 amount is available in that third addendum. 4 THE COURT: Okay. 5 All right. So, Ms. Leo, the Government gets to 6 speak last. I know you've answered a number of my questions. 7 I've read your memo - actually, before I let you have the 8 floor, I do have some questions. 9 Obviously, there are a number of citations to a bunch of Houston cases of sentences that were, basically, 10 11 720 months or more, one of them a 1,000 months, had a one-12 sentence on - that one was pretty egregious and it went to 1.3 trial. And - but I couldn't really tell much about the 720-14 month sentence. It seems like there were a bunch of those. 15 I assume there were others that were a lot 16 less -17 MS. LEO: Yes, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: You can just pick the ones that were the 19 most. 20 And is there - I don't know anything about those cases. I can't compare - to me every case is unique, but I 2.1 22 was sort of curious why you felt that was important for me to 23 know. I assume it's these - they were similar? 24 MS. LEO: Yes, Your Honor. They were similar in 25 nature. I know Defense counsel brought up that in other types

1.3

2.1

of cases where defendants received really lengthy sentences it's because the child pornography was monetized or something of that sort, and in these particular cases they weren't. And most of these cases are ones that I prosecuted or Ms. Zapp prosecuted. So, we're very familiar with the facts of them.

And they're cases that are similarly situated where we have a Defendant who raped and abused a family member and then either - and then, not all these cases did they go ahead and distribute them, but in a good number of them, the images had been distributed.

So, we just wanted to show to the Court, to highlight to the Court in response to the Defense's argument that nationally these cases are always - a lot of courts will downwardly depart. And so, it's our position that maybe that does happen, but here within our District that doesn't happen, that there are Guideline sentences that are imposed, which are very lengthy, which are 60 years, 80 years, and then that one particular case over a 1,000 years. But, again, that's a little different because it was a trial.

THE COURT: So - I mean, I have sentenced - if you were reading that transcript, I've sentenced a life sentence -

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: A life sentence.

THE COURT: -- to one.

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Yes.

THE COURT: But then I downward departed on the other

to 20 years, I think.

1.3

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Yes, Your Honor.

You did.

I think that the other concern that I had with - as the Court mentioned, they highlighted seven - eight cases to be precise, which would definitely support their position. However, I wanted the Court to be aware that the sentencing transnationally in total of the whole CP -

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: -- sentences it's not reflective of those eight cases. So, I think that the question before the Court is what is more beneficial to the party understanding of the Court those eight cases that the Government is highlighting, because they propose the idea that punishment will in turn be a deterrent or national trend since 2021 because we have - we now have the benefit of that U. S. Sentencing Commission Report saying that the Guidelines are plainly wrong. There's no other way to describe it. They - they say that the Guidelines do not reflect the idea when they were originally instituted.

So, I - again, I think that the most accurate number would be those 74 women that were sentenced on identical circumstances; that information comes from the Sentencing Commission, Your Honor. Those are not the statistics that I brought up for the sake of it. That's

1 something that anyone from the public can do if they have 2 access and a little bit of knowledge as to how to use the 3 gauging tool. 4 THE COURT: Sure. 5 And that was - that was about two hundred and 6 seventy something? 7 MR. ROSA-AMBERT: 297 was the average sentence. 8 THE COURT: 297, sure. 9 MR. ROSA-AMBERT: And nationally, for a total 10 population of not only women - man and women in total is 360, 11 which is definitely way less than the - what the Government is 12 requesting -1.3 THE COURT: Sure. 14 MR. ROSA-AMBERT: -- or proposing. 15 THE COURT: Sure. 16 Again, I've sentenced less and more, and, you 17 know, I have a life sentence I gave to a CP. 18 And - but then, you know, you have the 19 year-19 old whose got a cellphone, you know, with - that happens to 20 have child porn on it, you know, what do you do with that? 2.1 They use a computer. You know, and all the - all the 22 enhancements that are in these cases, you know, it gets hidden 23 to the 19 year-old kid, so there are reasons to vary in cases. Again, that last case that you've read about -24

or the transcript of - I felt there were significant reasons

25

why I should vary downward further, female.

1.3

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: In this particular case, Your
Honor, if I may, there are 10 enhancement points that would
essentially apply in every single case. I detailed those out.
So, what's the difference between this case and a person that
again monetized the offense or went to trial or had a higher
criminal history. For purposes of the Guidelines, it doesn't
matter because the level is 43, so that's mandatory life
whether the defendant is Category 1 or Category 6. So, that's
why I wanted to create that distinction in my memo.

THE COURT: Right.

But, I mean, I will also say the Sentencing

Commission has examined and re-examined these CP Guidelines.

This has been a topic of discussion for five, ten years. I

mean, for the years I've attended their annual seminar and

based - you know, the Commissioners have struggled with it.

There's a lot of Congressional pressure, I guess, to keep them

where they are, and it is - they are what they are because of

the belief. And I think in Congress that these are

appropriate.

And you have - and then, the Government cited some discussions of our Congressmen or Senators when they - I guess they were Senators when this act was adopted, so - Anyway - all right, so. So that -

You answered my question, Ms. Leo, about these

```
1
    other cases. Some of them are similar - or maybe a lot of
    them are similar. The outlier went to trial and lost.
 2
    seemed like a lot of them were - or all of them were males -
 3
 4
    and that they were - and that they all themselves engaged in
 5
    sexual acts with their children. And - but we have here a
 6
    female engaging in sexual acts with her child, and it's no
 7
    difference.
 8
                  So - and again, this - I'll let you speak.
 9
    I'll let you have the floor -
10
             MS. LEO: Your Honor?
             THE COURT: -- and then, I can make some summary
11
12
    comments.
13
             MS. LEO: Let me just ask - does the Court wish to
14
    hear from the victim's mother?
15
             THE COURT: Yeah. I will. I was going to let you
16
    speak -
17
             MS. LEO: Oh. Okav.
18
             THE COURT: -- and then I was going to hear from -
             MS. LEO: Perfect.
19
20
             THE COURT: Because there may be some response, but I
21
    was going to let you speak.
22
             MS. LEO: Okay.
23
             THE COURT: And then, I'll have the - does she - have
24
    you ever talked to her. Does she want to allocute?
25
             MS. LEO: Yes, Your Honor.
```

THE COURT: Okay.

1.3

2.1

Go ahead. I'll let you speak first.

MS. LEO: Yes, Your Honor.

Your Honor, as the Court is aware of my Sentencing Memorandum, the Government is requesting 60 years in regards to this particular case. We believe that it's appropriate under the 3353(a) factors.

The Court has already gone into the report that was submitted on behalf of the Defendant, Dr. Hays' report.

And I think that that is what is most troubling for the Government was reading that report, because that report just highlights how much of a danger the Defendant is to the community because she has this sexual interest in children.

And that sexual interest in children cannot be pertur- -- cannot be curved in any way, shape or form.

Your Honor, first and foremost, as the Court already brought up, the Defendant admitted that she has had a sexual interest in children since she was 10 years old. So, that's more than half of her life she has been sexually attracted to children. And that was in a setting, not that she was attracted to another 10 year-old, but she was attracted to a baby that her mother was babysitting.

Further, as the Court is aware and as the report indicates, she fantasizes about having sex with babies and toddlers. She fantasizes about having sex with children

1.3

between the age of four and seven. She also dreams about having sex with babies and toddlers and children.

So, this is someone who - it's as the Court brought out - it's her orientation. It's something that she is going to have to live with forever. And because of that orientation and because of the fact that we know she's not just looking at child pornography, but she's actually acting out - she's crossed that line. And she's abused not one child but two - two children who are very young - a two-year-old and a three-year-old. And this happened on multiple times, especially with the two-year-old.

The other thing is, Your Honor, we don't know what else she has done to these children, other than what she recorded herself doing to them, because they're too young to outcry. Maybe in the future they will remember what happened. Hopefully, they won't. Hopefully, this will not have affected them. But the fact of the matter is she traumatized, and she harmed these children and all for what -- her own sexual deviance.

Your Honor, as her job, her number one job should have been to protect and care for minor Victim 1, but she did the exact opposite when she used him, essentially, as a sex toy, and that's something that cannot be tolerated.

And, Your Honor, the other thing is, what is especially disturbing and the Court referenced this in regards

1.3

to the doctor's opinion about her to being a moderate to high risk to re-offend. It's not just solely on children. It's on the community at large. And what's interesting is the Defendant admitted to the doctor that she has had three infractions while she's been in - in custody pending this case, and two of them were in regards to drugs. And this, Your Honor, is on page 3 and 4 of the report.

But the third infraction deals with a write up that she had received from a miscommunication with a cellmate, who ended up submitting a Prison Rape Elimination Act Report against her, claiming that the Defendant was being sexually inappropriate and undressing in front of her, which the Defendant denied doing. But still, she was written up for that.

The other thing that is very disturbing is that to this day - and this is on page 7 - she talks about her viewing herself as a sex addict and that she's constantly thinking about sex and that she has stated that intrusive thoughts about sex have persisted during her incarceration, although she has not acted upon it.

So, this is someone clearly who is dangerous, who is a sexual deviant, and the only way to protect the public-at-large is for a lengthy term of incarceration, and that's why the Government is asking for the 60 years. We believe that it's warranted under these - under the situation

and under the 3553(a) factors.

1.3

2.1

The other thing that Defense brought up was arguing for a 20-year sentence, and I know he - Defense counsel is arguing that in 20 years she'll be in her midforties. She'll be maybe hitting menopause. Your Honor, for someone like the Defendant -

First off, there is many things wrong with that argument first off that someone would be in menopause at 45, but secondly, that anyone in menopause wouldn't have a sexual interest in children or be able to act upon it.

But the last and most important thing in — in regards to this particular Defendant — because of the way that she has had this deep-seated sexual interest, it's not going to stop her. The only way to stop her and to protect the public is a lengthy term of incarceration, and that's why, Your Honor, the Government is recommending and requesting that a 60-year sentence would be appropriate in this case. It would be appropriate to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, to provide just punishment for the offense and, especially, to protect the public. So, that's why we're asking for the 60 years.

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. LEO: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right.

And - so, we have a victim or a parent of a

victim here to allocute?

1.3

MS. LEO: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So, ma'am. I guess I'm not going to have you state your name. We'll just all recognize that you're the parent of minor MV 2, as the person is identified in the Presentence Report just to protect the identity of the victim.

So, you get to speak here on, really, anything how relevant, how it's impacted the child, how it's impacted
the family dynamic, what your - in other ways that, you know,
your relationships within your family and others, how it's
affected you.

So, you have the floor.

A PARENT: Thank you for allowing me to speak today.

THE COURT: Sure.

A PARENT: You know, this has really been, you know, difficult to deal with, just because of the fact that I trusted you to care for my child. And, you know, I look at her every day, and I don't trust anybody around my baby, no one - not my father, not my mother, no one.

And I'm thankful that, you know, she doesn't really remember anything. She's bright. She's beautiful. She's very educated.

THE COURT: About seven -

A PARENT: But I really don't know what she's really going to deal with in the future when she gets older, because

```
1
    I really don't know what you really did on those days that she
 2
    was with you. And she was with you for more than 8, 10 hours
    a day. And again, you only got caught on what you were doing.
 3
 4
                  I forgive you, but I will never forget. And I
 5
    hope that - not really that - that you learn from it, because
 6
    it's, like, it's something that you have, it's something that
 7
    you want, but I can - I really don't -
 8
             THE COURT: So, I have a few questions -
 9
             A PARENT: Yes.
10
             THE COURT: -- that weren't part of the factual
11
    summary.
12
                  So, the Defendant here, Ms. Sidney, is, loosely,
1.3
    a sister-in-law?
14
             A PARENT: Yes.
```

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay.

And she - I guess you used her for child care for your child?

A PARENT: So, her mother would watch my daughter, and I guess on the days that her mother would have to work Sidney would watch her. And so - and it's crazy, because I would think about the times when I would drop off my daughter she would cry. She would cry. And I'm, like, man, what's what's going on? And I'm, like, okay, maybe because she's new to being around her, you know. But now, I'm thinking she was crying for help, and I was ignoring that, not knowing that you

```
1
    were doing something to her.
 2
             THE COURT: And over what period of time was she -
    were you having her drop off the - for a year, two months?
 3
 4
             A PARENT: So, I would be at work at least by 6:30
 5
    and get off by four, so -
 6
             THE COURT: Did this -
 7
             A PARENT: -- eight or nine hours.
 8
             THE COURT: Did this go on for three months, six
 9
    months, a year -
10
             A PARENT: Uh- --
             THE COURT: -- two years?
11
12
             A PARENT: I think she watched her - they were
13
    watching her for at least about six months, not that long.
14
             THE COURT: And were there other children there
15
    besides -
             A PARENT: My daughter would get dropped off, and
16
17
    sometimes my son would get dropped off as well.
18
             THE COURT: And -
             A PARENT: So, I'm not even sure if anything happened
19
20
    to my son at this point.
21
             THE COURT: And -
22
             A PARENT: And he was three - no, he was four, and
23
    she was three.
24
             THE COURT: A year older then. Okay.
25
              A PARENT: So, she really had three kids in her
```

```
1
    possession.
 2
             THE COURT: Okay.
 3
                  And so, this happened about four years ago. So,
 4
    they're in grade school now?
 5
             A PARENT: Yes, sir.
             THE COURT: They - and you said, "smart," so
 6
 7
    they're -
 8
             A PARENT: G- --
 9
             THE COURT: -- academically -
10
             A PARENT: GT kids.
             THE COURT: Doing what they should be doing?
11
12
             A PARENT: Doing great.
1.3
                  I did speak to my daughter - you know, she
14
    doesn't remember certain things, but again, I don't know what
15
    she internally knows or remembers deep down inside. And the
    thing is, this is forever going to be out there.
16
17
             THE COURT: So, it's Sidney's mother that now has
18
    her - MV 1?
19
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Yes, sir.
20
             THE COURT: Okay.
21
                  And do you have any interaction with that child?
22
             A PARENT: No. I do - I know he - he - he's not able
23
    to speak. He cannot talk, so. That's another thing.
    You're - you had a child -
24
25
             THE COURT: That's a physical - a genetic de- --
```

```
birth defect or something, or he's - he's mute?
 1
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: He has autism, Your Honor.
 2
             THE COURT: Autism.
 3
             MR. ROSA-AMBERG: But that was before, obviously.
 4
 5
             THE COURT:
                        Sure.
             A PARENT: I mean, I don't have anything else to say.
 6
 7
    I just, you know, want you to know I hope that, you know, I
    get justice, not only for my child, but for your son as well.
 8
 9
             THE COURT: Wow. I didn't catch that. Was that in
10
    the Presentence Report? I totally missed that the child was
11
    autistic.
12
             MS. LEO: It's actually in one of the letters that
1.3
    the Defense had submitted.
14
             THE COURT: Okay.
             MS. LEO: I think from the Defendant's mother who
15
16
    wrote about taking care of him and him being autistic.
17
             THE COURT: Okay.
18
                  All right. So - I mean, you've answered my
19
    questions. I'm sorry for all of this for you and your family
20
    and your children.
21
                  Hopefully, someday, your children are - or your
22
    daughter is experiencing - or I'm sorry - your son is
23
    experiencing problems - I'm sorry - your daughter - excuse
24
    me - that, you know, you'll - you won't ignore it. You know,
25
    you'll get them counseling and help.
```

```
1
             A PARENT: Yes, sir.
 2
             THE COURT: All right.
 3
                  Thank you very much.
 4
             A PARENT: Thank you.
 5
             THE COURT: You may be seated.
                  All right. And the grandmother is not here.
 6
 7
             MS. LEO: No, Your Honor.
 8
             THE COURT: Okay.
 9
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Your Honor, but grand- --
10
             THE COURT: You were making some notes. You want to
11
    reply?
12
             MR. ROSA-AMEERT: Grandfather is here. He's over my
1.3
    left shoulder.
14
             THE COURT: Okay.
15
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: They don't live together. Also, is
16
    the stepmother, Ms. Elexis' stepmother is here and her
17
    grandmother, her own grandmother. So, it would be that great
18
    grandmother of the - of MV 1.
19
             THE COURT: Okay.
20
                  Did you want to respond to anything?
21
                  I mean, you did in our reply brief, but you
22
    looked like you were jotting down some things, like maybe you
23
    were going to correct something that Ms. Leo said. No?
24
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: I - I think that the problem that I
25
    have with the Government's position, Your Honor, is, one,
```

they're asking the Court just to focus on the nature and characteristics of the offense and just outright forget about the whole set of all the 3553(a) factors.

Like, the other issue or the other problem that I have with this whole idea is that the Government doesn't seem to believe that their own treatment in BOP would work.

Right? We just don't know that. The rest is pure speculation. But we know that because of this - of her age she has the opportunity to be redeemable, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yeah, I don't know if it works. I do know I have had a case where he was - he went to jail for sexual assault of a minor, spent 20 years in state prison, came out - again, this is a gentleman that looks to be about 70 years old - and then engaged in the production and distribution of child pornography. And so, I don't know what kind of treatment there is, but obviously for him it was a complete failure because he recidivated, I mean, within six months of getting out.

So, he was not allowed to have a cellphone, but he went and got one in another person's name and then was using the cellphone, engaged in distribution of child pornography.

So, I don't know what it is. It's hard to predict. I think the key thing that the Government has emphasized is the likelihood or threat for recidivism or the

risk of recidivism here. I think - you know, that even the - you know, none of us are professionals. We look at empirical data, but the evaluator here put a lot of weight on what the expert says about this. They understand the psychology more than any of us do, and he seems to have a lot of concern about this.

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: I - I think that the question would be whether he would have the same concerns 20 years from now or 25 and 30.

THE COURT: Sure.

2.1

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: And that - that's the real question before the Court.

THE COURT: Right.

And I think at some point - right.

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: I think that he had it at the time, because -

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Or she had it, because it's a female evaluator. I think that Dr. Missen (phonetic) Hays had that worry at the time, because that's the information that the client is providing. And I don't think she should be penalized for being honest, quite the opposite, like, the information is coming from here. Just because she acknowledges that she has a problem and she acknowledges that she needs treatment, as she has done before the Court today as

1 well. 2 THE COURT: But that's the whole point is - she has 3 to be candid with the evaluator, so the evaluator -4 MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Yes. 5 THE COURT: -- can make a good evaluation. And -MR. ROSA-AMBERT: And she was. 6 7 THE COURT: -- she was, and he - but he took those 8 bits of information and evaluated them, deliberated on them 9 and then wrote his report - or her report - excuse me - it's a 10 female - and it is of the conclusion, a pretty strong 11 conclusion that Ms. Sidney has a risk of recidivating. 12 MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Your Honor, if I may regarding 1.3 that. I do agree that that was the conclusion, but she also provided a detailed account as to what she would believe would 14 15 be necessary to lower that recidi- -- recidivism rate. 16 THE COURT: Sure. 17 MR. ROSA-AMBERT: I - she believes that that is 18 present right now but she doesn't make any opinion as to 19 what's going to happen in the future. However, she does believe that that risk would lower if she complies with the 20 2.1 recommendation she proposed in the - in the report. 22 THE COURT: All right. I'll consider that.

All right. I believe I've heard enough. My initial evaluation of this case is unchanged.

Let me pull up, so that I can recite all of the

23

24

25

1.3

2.1

special conditions of supervision that are going to have to be placed on Ms. Sidney. Let me pull up the Presentence Report here - and the Counts.

All right. So, the Court does adopt the factual findings contained within the Presentence Report. I do find it all correctly scored, and as a consequence she comes out to, you know, a level 43, which under the Guidelines is — is life.

However, the Court believes a life sentence doesn't satisfy the 3553(a) factors and even the Government is not suggesting a life sentence but rather a 60-year sentence. And so, I'm going to make a variance, just given the circumstances of this case, her age, when she will complete her prison sentence. And the length of the sentence that I'm going to pronounce I believe will be sufficient deterrence to others, will be just punishment, will show respect for the law and those other 3553(a) factors.

As to Count 1, it is the judgment of the Court that the Defendant is committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 30 years. That's the maximum on that Count.

And as to Count 2, 3 and 4, the Court sentences Ms. Sidney to 10 years to run consecutively to Count 1.

On all four Counts, the Court - I'm sorry - on Counts 2, 3 and 4 three years of supervision; as to Count 1,

lifetime supervision.

1.3

2.1

And while on supervision, the Defendant is not to commit any other federal, state or local crime. She's to comply with the standard conditions adopted by this Court, abide by any mandatory conditions required by law.

In addition, she's not to possess a firearm or other destructive device; cooperate with providing a DNA sample.

And I impose the following special conditions:

First, she's to have no contact with any of the victims. However, she may have contact with minor Victim 1, her son, if requested and initiated by her son. And that all need to be - she'll need to get permission, though, with her Probation Officer to return any contact that's initiated by her son.

And in addition, she is required to register with the Sex Offender Registration Notification Act or any state sex offender registration agency in which she may reside, work or be a student.

In addition, she must not have direct contact with any child she knows or reasonably should know to be under the age of 18 without the permission of the Probation Officer.

If you do have any direct contact, you should advise your Probation Officer within 24 hours — contacting through written communication, in prison communication or physical contact or

through social media or the internet, any sort of social website.

You must not possess or view pornographic materials.

Let's see.

1.3

You are - you're required to permit your

Probation Officer to access any computer or electronic device

that you may own upon request without any prior notice to you,

so they may randomly monitor any form of computer electronic

device that you may own in the future, such as a cellphone.

Let's see.

You must participate in a Sex Offender Treatment
Program with all the rules and regulations of that program
until you complete it with the approval of the Probation
Officer and Program Director.

You must not preside, work, access or loiter within 100 feet of schoolyards, playgrounds, or other places primarily used by children, such as a Boys and Girls Club without approval by your Probation Officer.

You must not seek or maintain employment, supervise or volunteer or participate in any program or activity where minors under the age of 18 would congregate without prior written approval of your Probation Officer.

All right. So, those are your special conditions of supervision. Now, let me pull up -

```
1
                  The Court is also going to order a special
 2
    assessment of $100 as to each Count for a total of $400.
                  I find the Defendant indigent, so I waive any
 3
 4
    fine. However, I'm going to order restitution to the six
 5
    victims, and the Court is going to order the three-thousand-
 6
    dollar statutory minimum amount as to all six victims.
 7
    that'll be payable within 90 days of her release - I'm sorry.
 8
                  The Court will order that payable now, so that
 9
    it can be taken out of her earnings while at the BOP, so order
10
    that payable immediately.
                  Is there anything I've left out?
11
             MS. LEO: Your Honor, just for clarification
12
13
    purposes, the supervised release, the length of term for Count
14
    1 was that life then?
15
             THE COURT: That's the life.
16
             MS. LEO: Okay.
17
             THE COURT: Yeah. And the others I think the max is
18
    three years on those?
19
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT:
                               Three years, yes.
20
             MS. LEO: The minimum - the minimum is five years,
2.1
    Your Honor.
22
             THE COURT: The minimum is five years on the others?
23
             MS. LEO: Yes. Yes, Your Honor.
24
             THE COURT: Oh, okay. Well, then five years on those
25
    to run concurrent.
```

1 MS. LEO: Thank you, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Anything else I missed? PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, just for 3 4 clarification for the judgment. The total amount of 5 incarceration here is 40 years, correct? THE COURT: Correct, 480 months. 6 7 PROBATION OFFICER: And I - I believe those were the 8 same special conditions that were listed in the PSR, right? 9 THE COURT: Correct. That's where I was reading 10 from. 11 PROBATION OFFICER: Okay. I thought there were two I 12 didn't hear. You must warn of any other people who are using 1.3 computers, and then you should not subscribe to any other 14 computer online service? It is just -15 THE COURT: Yeah. I didn't - I'm going to allow 16 the - well, I'll add the - I must have missed the online 17 computer service. 18 How does that read, so that Ms. Sidney can know 19 what it is, if you wouldn't mind reading it. 20 PROBATION OFFICER: You shall not subscribe to any 21 computer online service nor should you access any internet 22 service during the length of your supervision unless approved 23 in advance in writing by the U. S. Probation Officer. 24 THE COURT: That's so vaque. 25 PROBATION OFFICER: And may not -

1 THE COURT: That's too vague. 2 PROBATION OFFICER: Okay. THE COURT: For example, if she wanted to look for a 3 4 job, could she go on the internet to look for a job? You 5 know, I want her to be able to do that. 6 PROBATION OFFICER: Okav. 7 THE COURT: I want her to be able to report to the 8 Probation Office electronically like they're permitted to do 9 from a computer. That's why I didn't band her from owning 10 electronic devices. I just want the Probation Officer to have 11 the ability to make unannounced inspections of her computer 12 and electronic devices. So, I'm not going to add that 1.3 restriction. 14 PROBATION OFFICER: Okay. 15 THE COURT: She is permitted to access - you can't 16 function in our society without an electronic device. 17 PROBATION OFFICER: And you did say the other 18 condition about warning others to use the computers; we're not 19 including that one? 20 THE COURT: I'm not including that one either, 2.1 correct. 22 All right. 23 So, this is your sentence. Ms. Sidney, you can 24 appeal; you will have two weeks to do so. You know, there 25 are - this is a lengthy sentence. I know you're going to be

1 70 years or just under that, I think, when you get out - maybe 2 67. You will get good time credit or 15% off that, 3 4 so that's probably going to knock another several years off of 5 it - five years or so. And there are - well, I don't know if 6 you can early release on - get a year off for the drug 7 I doubt it for this offense. Yeah, for this 8 offense, I don't think you're going to be eligible for that. 9 But -10 MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Your Honor, just in the sake of 11 caution, could you recommend that she be eligible for the RDAP 12 program in the off chance that she does get benefit? 13 THE COURT: Yeah. I mean, I'll recommend she be 14 placed so -15 MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Thank you. THE COURT: -- so that she can benefit from the RDAP 16 program, but the biggest priority is she's got to be in a 17 18 facility where she can have her Sex Offender Treatment 19 Program, and there are only two such facilities in the country 20 I think that have those programs. They try to put all -There are 14; there's two in Texas, 21 MR. ROSA-AMBERT: 22 Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Two in Texas. Okay. 24 MR. ROSA-AMBERT: Yes.

THE COURT: Well, that's likely where you will be is

25

```
1
    one of these two in Texas.
 2
                  All right. Anything else I need to add?
             PROBATION OFFICER: Just one more clarification, Your
 3
 4
    Honor -
 5
             THE COURT:
                         Sure.
 6
             PROBATION OFFICER: -- from Probation.
 7
                  In regard to the other special assessments, are
    those waived as well, the judgment for victims in trafficking
 8
 9
    and the ADEA?
10
             THE COURT: Those are the third - so, obviously, my
11
    priority is that the victims get their funds first, and
12
    there's just no way to pay the other - she's never going to be
1.3
    able to even pay the victims is my belief, given just the
14
    constraints of her employment, her age and just her ability to
15
    pay. So, I'll waive those others, you know, again, finding
16
    her indigent.
17
                  All right. Anything else?
18
             MS. LEO: Your Honor, the Government does have an
    Order of Forfeiture at sentencing for the Court.
19
20
             THE COURT: So, I saw Judge Miller enter a
2.1
    Preliminary Order of Forfeiture. This is just on her device,
22
    the devices?
23
             MS. LEO: Yes. Yes, Your Honor.
24
             THE COURT: Okay.
25
                  Any objection to that, the forfeitures?
```

```
1
             MR. ROSA-AMBERT: No. No, sir. Of course not.
 2
             THE COURT: All right. The Court will order them
    forfeited.
 3
 4
                  Can you -
 5
             MS. LEO: Or do you want me - I'm sorry, Your Honor.
 6
             THE COURT: Yeah. We don't -
 7
             MS. LEO: I can file it if that will give the
 8
    Court - to give her.
 9
             THE COURT: File it; it will get signed.
10
             MS. LEO: Okay.
             THE COURT: It's a motion?
11
12
             MS. LEO: It's just the Order -
1.3
             THE COURT: For a final -
14
             MS. LEO: -- of Forfeiture.
15
             THE COURT: Okay. So, you're going to orally move
    that I enter the Final Order of Forfeiture?
16
17
             MS. LEO: Yes, Your Honor.
18
             THE COURT: All right. And if you could e-mail
19
    Mr. Rodriguez or e-file it, and I'll get it signed.
20
             MS. LEO: Yes, Your Hono
21
                  I apologize.
22
             THE COURT: All right.
23
                  Thank you.
                  You're excused.
24
25
        (Proceedings concluded at 10:26:37 a.m.)
```

1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
3	HOUSTON DIVISION
4	
5	I, Linda Griffin, court approved transcriber, certify that
6	the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official
7	electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-
8	entitled matter.
9	
10	/s/ Linda Griffin October 13, 2023 Linda Griffin Date
11	Bacc
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	